

favoring development interests over others. When the public was asked what should happen when residential development conflicts with recreational access, almost all respondents thought development should be stopped. Most believed there was a need for greater control of development. In addition, the public overwhelmingly believed industry should pay to clean up its wastewater. Rhode Islanders placed a higher priority on shellfishing than on recreational use of the Bay. Over three quarters believed shellfishing should be given preference over boating and marinas when the uses conflict. Respondents saw three research topics as needing highest priority: the effects on water quality of raw sewage, industrial waste, and shoreline development.

Rhode Islanders were very opposed to uncontrolled development and pollution. They were also quite willing to personally incur the expense of increased management. Respondents stated their willingness to sacrifice jobs and tolerate increased housing and service costs if necessary to prevent pollution caused by increased development. In addition, most respondents would be willing to pay twice as much to ensure that shellfish would be safer to eat. Two-thirds of Washington residents would be willing to spend one dollar per month per household to clean up Puget Sound. While the Delaware and San Francisco studies did not specifically ask about willingness to pay, public support for tougher regulations, stronger enforcement, and increased research indicates a desire for more expenditures on environmental quality.